## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mattie Sarah Elizabeth Wilson,	)Civil Action No.: 6:13-2822-MGL
Plaintiff,	) )
VS.	ORDER AND OPINION
B D Roddy <i>aka</i> B Douglas Roddy <i>aka</i> Barksdale Douglas Roddy Jr; Malindea Lee, State Farm Ins Co; Richard Owens, Claim Representative for State Farm Ins,	) ) ) )
Defendants.	) ) )

Plaintiff Mattie Sarah Elizabeth Wilson ("Plaintiff") brings this civil action *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* against Defendants B D Roddy, *aka* B Douglas Roddy, *aka* Barksdale Douglas Roddy Jr; Malindea Lee, State Farm Ins Co; and Richard Owens, Claim Representative for State Farm Ins ("Defendants"), pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. (ECF No. 1.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin for pre-trial handling and a Report and Recommendation.

On October 29, 2013, Magistrate Judge Austin issued a Report and Recommendation recommending this court dismiss Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice and without service of process as the complaint alleges no basis for federal jurisdiction. (ECF No. 12.) The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and Recommendation and the serious consequences if she failed to do so. (ECF No. 12 at 5.) Plaintiff filed timely objections on November 18, 2013. (ECF No. 15.)

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *Id.* The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made.

Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and the court has considered them. Upon review of Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes that her objections provide no basis for this court to deviate from the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition. Plaintiff's objections are primarily non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Report and Recommendation, and fail to establish that the Recommendation errs in any respect.

The Magistrate Judge recommends dismissal due lack of federal jurisdiction. The issue of jurisdiction may be raised at any time by either party or *sua sponte* by this Court so that the Court does not decide controversies beyond its authority. *Plyer v. Moore*, 129 F.3d 728 (4th Cir. 1997). Recognizing the Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the Court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff's complaint and has determined that the pleadings simply do not allege a claim cognizable in this Court.

Therefore, after conducting a de novo review of the objections and considering the

6:13-cv-02822-MGL Date Filed 12/05/13 Entry Number 18 Page 3 of 3

record and applicable law, the Court finds that Plaintiff's objections have no merit and are hereby overruled. The Court adopts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and dismisses this matter without prejudice and without service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge

December 5, 2013 Spartanburg, South Carolina